

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/663,242	09/15/2003	Marc A. Finot	42P16457	2871
8791	7590 02/07/2006		EXAMINER	
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN 12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD			ULLAH, AKM E	
SEVENTH			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
LOS ANGE	ELES, CA 90025-1030		2874	
			DATE MAILED: 02/07/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/15/2003.

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)

6) U Other: ____.

Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Detailed Action

Applicant cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Status of the Application

Claims 1-34 are pending in this application.

A two-way restriction was made in this application. Applicant elected group I, claims 1-6, 13-25 and 29-31 elected with traverse for the examination purpose. Thus, claims 7-12, 26-28 and 32-34 have been withdrawn from consideration.

If applicant is aware of any prior art or any other co- pending application not already of record, he/she is reminded of his/her duty under 37 CFR 1.56 to disclose the same.

Information Disclosure Statement

The prior art document submitted by the applicant in the Information Disclosure Statement filed on September 15, 2003 have been considered and made of record (note see the attached copy of form PTO-1449).

Application/Control Number: 10/663,242 Page 3

Art Unit: 2874

Specification

The use of the trademark KOVAR has been noted in this application. It should capitalize wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of the trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner, which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

Trademark or Trade Name As A Limitation In The Claim

Claims 3 and 16 contain the trademark/trade name KOVAR. Where a trademark or trade name is used in a claim as a limitation to identify or describe a particular material or product, the claim does not comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. See *Ex parte Simpson*, 218 USPQ 1020 (Bd. App. 1982). The claim scope is uncertain since the trademark or trade name cannot be used properly to identify any particular material or product. A trademark or trade name is used to identify a source of goods, and not the goods themselves. Thus, a trademark or trade name does not identify or describe the goods associated with the trademark or trade name. In the present case, the trademark/trade name is used to identify/describe top and bottom portion include metal alloy and, accordingly, the identification/description is indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-6,13-25 and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lake et al (US Pub. No. 2003/0223709 A1) or Steinberg et al (US Pub. Bo. 2003/0081914).

Both (Lake et al and Steinberg et al) disclose a ringframe module package for hermetically enclosing an optical fiber end aligned with an optical component comprising:

--- an bottom portion

--- a top portion to mate over said bottom portion at a seam to form a package

- --- a fiber feed through
- --- an optical fiber having a first portion inside of the package and a second portion outside of the package extending through the feed through,
 - --- a laser weld joint at seam, and
 - ---- a glass solder inside of feed through coaxial with fiber.

Both references explicitly fails to mention a reflowed glass solder inside of feed through coaxial with fiber

Lake et al is the evidence that ordinary skill in the art would find a reason, suggestion or motivation to have the hermetic sealing package as claimed in the sealing optical and electro-optical package.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to use a reflowed glass solder inside of feed through coaxial with fiber in the hermetic sealing package by Lake et al with any desired sealing package, since paragraph (0029) of Lake et al stated that one could utilize a low melting, i.e., low softening point sealing glass material to hermetically seal the edge of cover to ringframe.

Thus, any one of the above mentioned reference would function equally well regardless of specific function of the hermetic sealing package. It is also

Page 6

noted that applicant has not described this directional coupling as being critical or as yielding unexpected benefits. Certainly a person of ordinary skill in the art would find it beneficial to reduce the dependence of couplers on polarization changes.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Verdiell (USP NO. 6,207,950), Shinde et al (USP NO. 2004/0114884 A1), Kocian et al (USP NO. 5,550,398) are also cited to show atypical hermetic sealing package respectively.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Akm Enayet Ullah whose telephone number is 571-272-2361. The examiners can normally be reached on Monday through Wednesday from 5:30 am to 4:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rodney Bovernick, can be reached on Monday through Friday whose telephone number is 571-272-2344. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2874

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Akm Enayet Ullah Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2874

Aullah

February 01, 2006